

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, 14, 19, 26, 34, and 40 of the present application have been amended for clarification purposes.

Claims 3, 9, 16, 21, 28, 36 and 42 have been cancelled.

Regarding the examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, it is respectfully submitted that the IKE protocol (as defined, for example, in RFC 2409) references both security association payloads and delete payloads as defined by the ISAKMP protocol. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 2, 8, 15, 20, 27, 35, and 41 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

During a telephonic interview between the undersigned attorney and the examiner on 2/16/2006, the various rejections of the claims were discussed with respect to the present invention and the cited prior art references. At the conclusion of the telephonic interview, it was agreed that Maughan appears to teach only sending reason information as part of a NOTIFY payload, therefore requiring multiple payloads to send a control message that includes a control action and reason information relating to the control action. Further, it is submitted that Maughan does not teach or suggest providing a first payload of a control message, wherein the first payload is selected from a group consisting of: a security association payload and a delete payload, and wherein the first payload includes explicit reason information relating to at least one reason for the generation of the control message.

Moreover, it is submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in Maughan for the desirability of combining NOTIFY payload data (e.g., reason information) with either security association payload data or delete payload data to thereby generate a single modified security association payload or delete payload which includes a control action and explicit reason information relating to at least one reason for the generation of the control action. Further, it is submitted that Maughan teaches away from embodiments of the claimed invention such as those defined in independent claims 1, 7, 14, 19, 26, 34, and 40 since Maughan clearly teaches the desirability of providing explicit reason information as a separate payload (e.g., NOTIFY payload), thereby teaching the desirability of providing multiple different payloads for sending a control message which includes a control action and explicit reason information relating to the control action.


Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 7, 14, 19, 26, 34, and 40 are neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Maughan and/or other cited prior art of record.

Because claims 1-52 are believed to be allowable in their present form, many of the examiner's rejections in the Office Action have not been addressed in this response. However, applicant respectfully reserves the right to respond to one or more of the examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses. Further, the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art of record.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Dean E. Wolf
Reg. No. 37,260



P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100